

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

This Amendment is in response to the Office Action of October 3, 2005, in which the Examiner (1) rejected claims 2, 4, 6, 8-12, 22, 24 and 25 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application No. 2003/0154135 and Paper No. 20041018 ("**Covington**"), (2) rejected claim 7 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Covington** in view of Communications Today (Paper #2, PTO-892, Item: U ("**CT**") and (3) rejected claim 23 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Covington** in view of Patent No. 5,862,325, Paper No. 20041018 ("**Reed**").

Applicant appreciates the courtesy extended by the Examiner during a telephone interview on December 23, 2005. During that interview, the references were discussed in relation to the pending claims. It is the undersigned's understanding that the Examiner now believes a further search may be warranted in view of the discussion. Since amendments have not necessitated this new search, Applicant requests that the next Office action not be made final.

Applicant has added new claim 26, as discussed with the Examiner. Claim 26 recites subject matter similar to that of claim 23, with additional limitations similar to those found in dependent claims 9 and 11.

As to the rejection of the claims, Applicant believes all claims (including new claim 26) are distinguishable from the cited references.

Covington, the principal reference relied upon by the Examiner, shows a system where a user may create a wish list or shopping cart of desired products (i.e., a wish list of gifts), by using a PC 28 to access a shopping website portal 30. The user (the person creating the wish list) and a potential shopper buying gifts for the user may each go to a store or mall where the items are displayed at a PDA 20. The user may use the PDA to add to the wish list at the store, and the shopper buying for the user may use the PDA at the store to identify and facilitate the purchase of items on the wish list.

Unlike Applicant's invention, the items on the wish list in **Covington** are not information items accessed at an on-line directory website (such as recited in independent claim

22). Furthermore, **Covington** does not disclose accessing the information items using a computer, and transmitting the information items in the shopping cart to the portable device “when the portable device is at the location of the computer and in direct communication with the computer,” and then using the information items at the portable device “when the portable device is at a remote location away from the computer and not in direct communication with the computer,” as also recited in claim 22.

In **Covington**, the PDAs used by the user and the shopper are not directly linked to the computers (28, 32) that are used to access the shopping websites (24, 30), but rather are loaded and used only at a mall or store that is remote from the computer accessing the websites. In contrast to **Covington**, the invention of Applicant has particular usefulness with an on-line directory website, permitting a user to access directory information on the website using his/her personal computer and directly loading that information into a PDA connected directly to the personal computer. The PDA may then be taken by the user when traveling and used to access the downloaded directory information (e.g., addresses, phone numbers, travel directions, etc.). Such a function and purpose would not be possible with **Covington**, because the PDA in **Covington** is always at a store or mall and is not connected for direct communications with the user’s personal computer.

The Examiner also cites **Covington** for its showing of a directory (page 4, paragraph 0069). However, the reference in **Covington** to a “directory” is for a directory or index that is used to electronically access data in the central database 38. It is not an “on-line directory website” as recited by Applicant, which is known to be clearly different (i.e., the directory website as disclosed and defined in Applicant’s specification, for example, that lists phone numbers, addresses, maps, driving directions, and so forth.)

The Examiner rejected dependent claim 7 on the basis of **Covington** in view of **Communications Today**, citing the disclosure in **Communications Today** of different display screen formats that may be chosen by users. Claim 7 recites much more than the selection of screen formats. Neither **Covington** nor **Communications Today** show the entire method of

claim 7 (including, for example, the elements recited in its parent claims, such as the use of a portable device both at a computer and away from the computer, the use of the computer to access a directory website that provides yellow pages directory listings, as well as other elements recited in its parent claims 22 and 24). Thus, the subject matter of claim 7 is not disclosed, taught, or suggested by **Covington** or **Communications Today**, either alone or as combined by the Examiner.

The other dependent claims (claims 2, 4, 6, 8-12, 24 and 25) are likewise not disclosed, taught, or suggested by **Covington**, **Communications Today** or the other cited references (alone or combined).

The Examiner rejected independent claim 23 on the basis of **Covington** in view of **Reed**. The Examiner cited **Reed** for its disclosure of a yellow pages directory server that may be accessed for on-line information. It is believed that the subject matter of claim 23, including the use of a portable device having one location (whereby it has a direct communication link to a computer for receiving selected information from a yellow pages directory website) and having second, remote locations away from the computer (for being used to access the selected information items at the portable device) is clearly not disclosed in either **Covington** or **Reed**. If anything, **Reed** teaches away from Applicant's invention, since it discloses accessing and communicating with a large, complex database by a consumer computer over the Internet (see, e.g., Fig. 1, and column 12, lines 25-30). The browsers needed for such communication are provided in Applicant's disclosed personal computer 1, but the **Reed** system does not solve the problem of accessing and using on-line directory information at a portable device (e.g., by using Applicant's steps of providing a direct communications link for downloading such information to a portable device, and then using the portable device away from the computer where the information is needed by the user).

Appl. No. 09/991,158
Amdt. dated January 3, 2006
Reply to Office Action of October 3, 2005


PATENT

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants believe all claims now pending in this Application are in condition for allowance. The issuance of a formal Notice of Allowance at an early date is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at 303-571-4000.

Respectfully submitted,



Stephen F. Jewett
Reg. No. 27,565

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP
Two Embarcadero Center, Eighth Floor
San Francisco, California 94111-3834
Tel: 303-571-4000
Fax: 415-576-0300
SFJ:bhr
60639249 v1